

Brussels, 12 May 2023

COST 038/23

DECISION

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding for the implementation of the COST Action “Establishing Networks to Implement the Principles on Effective Interviewing for Investigations” (IMPLEMENDEZ) CA22128

The COST Member Countries will find attached the Memorandum of Understanding for the COST Action Establishing Networks to Implement the Principles on Effective Interviewing for Investigations approved by the Committee of Senior Officials through written procedure on 12 May 2023.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

For the implementation of a COST Action designated as

COST Action CA22128

ESTABLISHING NETWORKS TO IMPLEMENT THE PRINCIPLES ON EFFECTIVE INTERVIEWING FOR INVESTIGATIONS (IMPLEMENDEZ)

The COST Members through the present Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) wish to undertake joint activities of mutual interest and declare their common intention to participate in the COST Action, referred to above and described in the Technical Annex of this MoU.

The Action will be carried out in accordance with the set of COST Implementation Rules approved by the Committee of Senior Officials (CSO), or any document amending or replacing them.

The main aim and objective of the Action is to support, enable and progress various countries' developments towards full implementation of the Mendez principles that underpin effective interviews for investigation and information gathering of criminal suspects, victims and witnesses in line with science, law and ethical standards. This will be achieved through the specific objectives detailed in the Technical Annex.

The present MoU enters into force on the date of the approval of the COST Action by the CSO.

OVERVIEW

Summary

Interviews conducted across the world by police and other law enforcement agencies with suspects, victims and witnesses are crucially important in determining criminal justice outcomes. The Action Team knows from their combined expertise that there are two distinct approaches worldwide.

Firstly, several Member countries have developed (or are developing) an ethical approach termed 'investigative interviewing', that aims to obtain detailed and reliable information, while respecting human rights. This approach is consistent with the 2021 United Nations Declaration of the 'Principles of Effective Interviewing', known as the 'Mendez Principles' after the UN Special Rapporteur; Professor Juan Mendez. Over a three-year period, he led a committee of experts including those in law, forensic psychology and criminology alongside representation from civil society, culminating in the formal declaration of the principles that are grounded in science, law and ethics (see, <https://interviewingprinciples.com/>).

Secondly, however, it is well chronicled both from the literature and actual cases that law enforcement agencies in most countries remain unaware of the investigative interviewing approach, undertaking unethical practices, characterized by guilt presumption and confession-orientation that often rely on psychological manipulation, intimidation or physical torture, and can lead to miscarriages of justice and failed investigations.

This Action involves a timely and much-needed strategy of convening regional and in-country networks of researchers, practitioners and policy makers working with each other and with the Action Team to build on our early work to enable wider implementation of the 'Mendez Principles', ending cruel and inhumane practices that have adversely affected so many lives through unethical interrogations.

Areas of Expertise Relevant for the Action ● Psychology: Social psychology ● Law: Criminal law ● Languages and literature: Use of language: form, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, lexicography, terminology ● Political Science: Public administration, public policy ● Psychology: Neuropsychology	Keywords ● Investigative Interviewing ● Interrogation ● Torture ● Suspects of Crime ● Victims and Witnesses of Crime
--	---

Specific Objectives

To achieve the main objective described in this MoU, the following specific objectives shall be accomplished:

Research Coordination

- Develop a strategic framework for investigation transformation (FIT), underpinning the Mendez Principles that is agreed through collaboration with networks of researchers, practitioners and policy makers including countries yet to fully adopt those principles.
- Develop adapted models of investigative interviewing, jointly with stakeholders that accommodate local contexts/cultures but do not distort the Mendez Principles, and continue to observe law, ethics and science
- Promote the development of Mendez Centres of Interviewing Excellence
- Promote agreed frameworks for investigation transformation (FITs) for implementation of the Mendez principles in place, pathways and the formulation of models of investigative interviewing and involving any

required adaptations of the Mendez Principles.

- Disseminate agreed methodologies and tools that are consistent with the Mendez Principles to assist in the implementation of those Principles

Capacity Building

- Build a networking structure that creates ‘an ecosystem for learning’ to implement the Mendez Principles, appropriately incorporating legal frameworks, policies that support ethical interviewing, standards that are transparent and accountable, institutional leadership, training, guidance and support, and a research evidence base
- Through development of a matrix of FITs, build and support regional and in-country networks of researchers, practitioners and policy makers that help strengthen the pillars of the ecosystem
- Promote the development and strengthening of capacity building skills and tools to investigators, defense and prosecution lawyers as well as judges, to undertake their roles professionally, while increasing their awareness and understanding of the Mendez Principles and ethical interviewing
- Promote the Mendez Centres of Interviewing Excellence to act as hubs and repositories for resources for multiple and multi-country stakeholders, to share experiences, sustain resilience during and beyond implementation of the Mendez Principles, and help advance science, policy and practice during and beyond the Action
- Provide capacity building opportunities to more stakeholders including existing practitioners, policy makers and research communities, through the implementation of proactive and inclusive network activities.
- Provide capacity building opportunities to more ITCs and NNCs through the implementation of proactive and inclusive network activities that specifically target them.
- Provide capacity building opportunities to more Young Researchers and Innovators (YRIs) through the implementation of proactive and inclusive network activities that specifically target them.
- Encourage and support partners to develop mechanisms aiming at expansion and sustainability of the Action, beyond the Action's lifetime.

TECHNICAL ANNEX

1. S&T EXCELLENCE

1.1. SOUNDNESS OF THE CHALLENGE

1.1.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE OF THE ART

In England and Wales, miscarriages of justice triggered changes in law, policy and practice during the late 20th Century (Gudjonsson, 2018). These changes included the introduction and implementation of an investigative interviewing model that has as its aim, not gaining confessions (as was the case before) but accurate and detailed information/evidence from suspects, victims and witnesses. The embracing of such a model by the police service (and the outlawing and removal from practice of interview techniques associated with false testimonies/confessions) led to substantial reductions in the number of failed investigations/prosecutions, with, for example, almost no overturned cases in their Court of Appeal being grounded in poor interviewing techniques (Poyser, Nurse & Milne, 2018).

Interviews with suspects, victims, and witnesses are among the most important and regular tasks undertaken by police/law enforcement agencies to progress criminal investigations (Walsh & Bull, 2012). Yet, evidence via the media, NGO reports and extensive research finds that in many parts of the world cruel, inhumane, coercive, and unethical practices continue (Walsh, Oxburgh, Redlich & Myklebust, 2016)). However, rapport-based practices in countries such as England and Wales, Norway and Australia, (described by the term 'investigative interviewing') have repeatedly and consistently been found in both scientific research and in actual cases to be not only more ethical and respectful of human rights, but also more effective in gaining detailed and reliable information from suspects, victims, and witnesses, providing the basis for sound decision-making by authorities conducting investigations and information-gathering processes and avoiding miscarriages of justice (Alison et al., 2013; Gabbert et al., 2021; Kelly, Redlich & Miller, 2015; Walsh & Bull, 2012).

This interviewing model recognises and respects all interviewees' human rights during custodial interviews/interrogations, and also provides safeguards through measures such as the audio/video recording of police interviews with suspects and with vulnerable victims/witnesses (such as minority groups, children, those with mental or developmental disorders and those reporting being victims of sexual crimes, such as rape). Further legal safeguards for suspects ensure that they are provided with access to legal representation/advice and the outlawing of certain tactics (such as police interviewers using aggressive questioning or exaggerating/lying about evidence).

In 2021, the 'Principles on Effective Interviewing' drafted by leading experts was launched by the UN which provided members for the first time with a clear set of recommendations (and minimum international requirements) relating to law enforcement interviewing practices, based on science, ethics and law. The elimination of torture and inhumane treatment by the police (and more generally law enforcement) in the course of their investigations is central to ethical and fair legal procedures worldwide, and yet many countries do not fully adhere to the standards of what are now known as the 'Mendez Principles' (Mendez, 2021).

The Mendez Principles, in contrast to coercive practices, emerge from the models used in those above-mentioned countries. The Principles provide a normative framework to the international community for effective interviews that avoids human rights abuses, including torture and ill-treatment, as well as making the investigation of crime, including transnational offences, more effective and consistent. Intrinsic to the Mendez Principles is the advocacy of rapport-based interviewing. Such principles, policies and procedures have been accepted and adapted into practices and legal frameworks in a (currently limited) number of other countries (e.g., New Zealand) with similar positive effects on criminal investigations and case outcomes (Walsh et al., 2016). Other countries (e.g., Belgium, Ireland, The Netherlands have also recently adopted (or are adopting) investigative interviewing practices. Yet it remains understood from research and NGO reports that most countries (including many from the Cost.EU Nearby Neighbouring Countries [NNCs] and those in the Global South) are still undertaking coercive and unethical interrogations, despite the declaration of the Mendez Principles (Barela et al., 2020).

Since it is known that the goal of obtaining accurate and reliable information requires interviewees (whether victims, witnesses or suspects) to trawl from their memory details as to what happened, interviewers should be mindful of the challenges in obtaining a description of events that is as free as possible from error or defect. Well rooted in the science is the knowledge that memory can be fragile, imperfect, incomplete and may degrade quickly (Howe, Knott, & Conway, 2017).

Therefore, interviewers should seek to gather and record an account of what occurred during an event under examination, which is as factual and complete as possible without omissions or distortion. Since the purpose of interviews/interrogations is to achieve information that can progress investigations, attempts therefore to obtain reliable information from those deliberately placed under duress during interrogations have been established as counterproductive due to the extreme effects of stress and anxiety has on the brain, impacting adversely on the ability to retrieve accurate recall (O'Mara, 2015).

These well-established coercive practices are those then understood to prompt false confessions from those interviewed as suspects of crime and/or elicit tainted information, leading to flawed decision-making, wrongful convictions, miscarriages of justice and ruined lives (Gudjonsson, 2018). It has been reported that 27% of overturned convictions, involved innocent suspects earlier making false confessions, largely under the duress of harsh and unfair police interrogation (see <https://innocenceproject.org/>). Beliefs that coercive treatment in interviews is effective are known to persist, involving practices of intimidation and mistreatment (Walsh et al., 2016). Yet this is a known misconception since such interview practices are not only ineffective, but also the science has found them counterproductive, putting at risk victims, perpetrators, institutions, and society at large (Vrij et al., 2017; Meissner et al., 2014). Furthermore, ill-treatment (such as torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment) transgresses international law. At the same time, research has found that ethical interviewing practices to be more likely lead to suspects making true confessions (Cleary & Bull, 2019), as well as them providing more reliable information (Walsh & Bull, 2012). These techniques have also been found associated with improved pre-trial experiences for complainants (Bull, 2015).

To add further evidence as to the importance of investigative interviewing approaches, forensic linguistics studies have found that interviewees occupy a less powerful speaking role in the interview as a result of the status granted to investigators by justice and other state-sanctioned institutions (Heydon, 2005). The opportunity for interviewees to access their legal rights, such as the right to remain silent or the right to legal representation, is substantially reduced when there is any communication barrier between participants (see Erlich, Eades & Ainsworth, 2016). Additionally, linguistic research has demonstrated that when investigators control the talk during the interview, interviewees are less able to contribute detailed accounts, which undermines the central purpose of an interview, being the elicitation of reliable and accurate information (Heydon 2005). The investigative interviewing practices endorsed in the Mendez Principles provide a discourse framework that is better suited to safeguarding the linguistic rights of individuals being interviewed by police than the coercive and dominating discursive behaviour promoted by guilt-presumptive and confession-focused interrogation practices.

Thus, the Mendez Principles, based on science, law and ethics, represent an invaluable opportunity to help eradicate malpractices involved in harsh and hostile interrogations, especially where the resources needed to effect change are in short supply (Barela, Fallon, Gaggioli, & Ohlin, 2020; Delahunty & Howes, 2017). These aims will be met by undertaking networking arrangements to bring together researchers, practitioners and policy makers both from within the same country and from the same global regions, to work alongside members of the Action Team to provide a platform for transformation, which will be followed up by the delivery of training organised by the Action Team.

It is also recognised that practices in any country are likely a product of a confluence of circumstances and contexts deriving from policing, social, legal, cultural, political and economic traditions and conditions that prevail. The Action thus will need to consider these important influences when working with countries in adapting the Mendez Principles (without significant distortions their original intent) to provide a scientific base for their modified adoption as the Action develops.

The Mendez Principles provide a departure from accusatory, coercive, manipulative and confession-driven practices towards scientific rapport-based interviewing. Beyond this, they endorse the application of legal and procedural safeguards when suspects, victims and witnesses are being interviewed. Together, such ethical practices, when understood and operationalised in light of both EU Directives and decisions of the European Court of Human Rights (such as those establishing, in particular, the right to legal advice) reduce risks of ill-treatment, produce more reliable information and help ensure that investigations have just and lawful outcomes.

Legal and procedural safeguards grounded in international legal norms are an essential component of the interviewing process (and of the Mendez Principles). Their effective implementation before, during, and after the interview contributes to the success of the process, by ensuring respect for human rights and enhancing the reliability and evidentiary value of the information obtained. These safeguards increase the likelihood of fair treatment throughout the information-gathering and judicial processes and the attaining of legally sound outcomes. Various UN resolutions and EU directives have been issued that cover the arrest, detention and questioning of suspects to ensure ethical and effective interviewing is protected by international human rights

law. For example, the right to silence, is not specifically mentioned in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) but the European Court of Human Rights has held that this right under police questioning and the privilege against self-incrimination are generally recognized international standards which lie at the heart of the notion of a fair procedure under Article 6. Furthermore, affirmed by the UN Human Rights Committee, the UN General Assembly, and the ECHR (under Article 5), a person has the right to be informed of reasons for their arrest and why they are being deprived of their liberty. Additionally, those whose language is not that of the country in which they are being questioned by policing agencies etc. have the right to free access to an interpreter under ECHR Article 6(3)(e). Further safeguards are those that provide the right (i) to notify a relative or third party of one's detention; (ii) of access to legal advice; and (iii) of access to a doctor. Meanwhile UN resolution 43/173 Principle 23 relates to the recording of each interview a person undergoes as a suspect of crime.

The European Court of Human Rights has thus emphasised that legal systems should be based upon the rule of law and evidence obtained through interviews should not be obtained through forms of ill treatment and in accordance with police procedural due process (see Barela et al., 2020). The Mendez Principles represent a clear statement of expected practices. These practices are defined as humane, being reflective of respecting human rights, yet they have not so far been underpinned by any global strategy to positively affect practices in those many countries still known to be adhering to unethical practices, that have been described in the Mendez Principles as 'cruel and inhumane'. Therefore, the Action aims to form and develop sustainable networks in countries and regions that lay the foundations of actionable strategies to underpin the introduction/implementation of the Mendez Principles, mindful of the continuing advancement of the science that underpin them.

The Action builds on our established networks between ourselves and key global/national policy makers and NGOs such as the Association for the Prevention of Torture, The Anti-Torture Initiative, Fair Trials, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, Council of Europe, Office for Security of Central Europe, Convention against Torture Initiative, and the UN (including its Office on Drugs and Crime), as well as the current UN Special Rapporteur on Torture. The Action will also work with policing practitioners and organisations across the world (e.g., The International Policing Association, which has over 370,000 practitioner members worldwide and has expressed interest in their involvement in the Action) alongside police forces around the world, many of whom the Action Team have already cultivated excellent working relationships. The Action Team also aims to work with Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe, the European Criminal Bar Association and the European Network of Councils for the Judiciary in order to help provide the skills and knowledge for lawyers and judges. Letters of endorsement from these bodies can be obtained upon request.

These various partnerships underpin our development of mutual long-term intra- and inter-country, regional and global networks between researchers, practitioners, and policy makers. Such endeavours aim to positively affect research, policy and practice to progress scientific, practice and policy developments and enable implementation strategies in the adoption of the Mendez Principles concerning interviews with suspects, victims, and witnesses. As such, the Action aims to reduce practices likely to lead to adverse outcomes such as obtaining unreliable evidence or confessions through coercive interviewing. Enhancing the accuracy and reliability of information gathered during interviews serves civil societies' rightful expectations toward their criminal justice systems. Globally, a commonality of interviewing/interrogation methods will improve cross-jurisdictional cooperation, aiding the effective policing and investigation of transnational crimes.

Despite research establishing the benefits of the investigative interviewing approach, more studies are required in certain areas. The Action also aims to research these matters to improve the evidence base. For example, we know that interviews do not exist in isolation. That is, whether conducted with suspects, victims or witnesses, they are part of evidence and information-gathering processes conducted during investigations. Decisions made such as to follow certain lines of enquiry and those concerning the generation of hypotheses impact on interviews. Furthermore, how humanely or otherwise people are treated upon arrest and how they are treated in custody is also thought to have impacts on subsequent interviews, but this matter has been barely covered in the extant research.

Moreover, central to a large number of miscarriages of justice lies a vulnerable interviewee, be they witness, victim or suspect, and thus it is especially important to safeguard against inappropriate interviewing methods within this realm. Those deemed vulnerable, due to internal factors (such as those young in age, the very elderly, or those having a mental or developmental disorder) and/or due to an increasing number of interviewees requiring an interpreter, or other external factors (e.g., victims of war crimes and the influence of trauma upon sexual offences victims) need interviewers who are highly skilled, well trained, and are specialists at dealing with complex cases and being able to adapt flexibly within the interview environment. A particular vulnerable group of interviewees is children. Research here has indicated that the questioning strategies of interviewers have a major

impact on what children report, the amount and quality of the information they report, as well as the perceived reliability of the disclosure (Lamb et al., 2018). Thus, the importance of appropriate, research-based training for investigative interviewers cannot be overestimated (Lahtinen, 2022).

A further area requiring more research concerns language diversity. That is, the Mendez Principles encourages dissemination of the investigative interviewing method to police and other law enforcement officers in countries around the globe. However, a key challenge for agencies in various countries is likely to be ensuring the consistency of investigative interviewing when it is implemented in diverse linguistic, cultural and legal contexts (Hope et al., 2021). For instance, using precisely worded questions is an essential tool in the interviewing training method promoted by the Mendez Principles. The specific impact of appropriately worded questions can be lost in translation from the principles without careful consideration of how the interviewing principles will function in local languages and in situations where cross-cultural and multilingual interviewing is undertaken through interpreters (Tipton, 2019). Similarly, cultural and legal contexts that affect the effective implementation of ethical interviewing practices must be understood and assessed and the scientific findings applied to any programme of implementation, agreed by the host country, following Muniroh and Heydon (2022).

In sum, despite advances made in the forensic sciences (e.g., DNA testing), the outcome of most criminal cases and investigations still remains highly dependent on personal interactions, such as interviews/interrogations of suspects, victims and witnesses. Miscarriages of justice result in wrongful convictions of the innocent, avoidance of punishment for the guilty, and a lack of confidence in the police and the criminal justice system for suspects, victims and witnesses and, indeed, the wider public. Research and actual case studies have both found these miscarriages of justice to be attributable either to coercive interview/interrogations of suspects prompting false confessions or to poor questioning of suspects, victims and witnesses (that fail to gain reliable, detailed information).

The Action will also build on the team's existing various efforts with countries around the globe to implement the Mendez Principles, only limited thus far by resources, but those which have been effective in terms of showing evidence of a template for wider implementation. Finally, the Action's aims are consistent with the UN's SDG 16 that promotes peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, to provide access to justice for all and to build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

1.1.2. DESCRIPTION OF THE CHALLENGE (MAIN AIM)

The 2021 Mendez Principles (consistent with investigative interviewing models) act as a timely, evidence-based and appropriate platform for extending scientific knowledge translation towards more effective interviewing, that is overdue and urgently needed in many countries to (i) avoid further miscarriages of justice (including failures to bring crime perpetrators to justice); (ii) prompt the discontinuance of unethical interview tactics; and (iii) align national legal systems with fundamental, international human rights standards.

The Action will

- Convene national/international networks and deliver training, providing the appropriate leadership from the Action team's extensive expertise to nurture the conditions over the Action's life-cycle from which the knowledge base can be translated to policies and practice.
- Develop models of adaptation, addressing the research questions; What are a country's cultural, social, legal, policing, economic, political conditions and traditions etc that act as either inhibitors or enablers to the adoption of the Mendez Principles?
- Negotiate pathways towards the adoption of the Mendez Principles in consideration of these important contexts, without distortion of the original Principles, in order to develop a model of investigative interviewing in that country that further extends the global scientific base of knowledge concerning investigative interviewing, and how to address known and identified shortfalls in knowledge (as noted within 1.1.1)
- Develop a model of resilience to sustain growth of knowledge and scientific developments

Addressing these research questions will identify, confront and help overcome the current/existing barriers to the adoption of the Mendez Principles of ethical investigative interviewing, enlarging and enriching the scientific investigative interviewing base.

1.2. PROGRESS BEYOND THE STATE-OF-THE-ART

1.2.1. APPROACH TO THE CHALLENGE AND PROGRESS BEYOND THE STATE OF THE ART

The Mendez Principles will be the guiding tenet of all educational activities for police and law enforcement activities in those countries where the network/partnerships will be installed. The Action Team are not naïve to the challenges that lie ahead, recognising that some countries may display a greater willingness and institutional commitment to embracing the Mendez Principles, but that there may also be resistance elsewhere that may manifest (for example) in the denial of unethical interviewing and interrogation tactics. Such denials may emerge from a lack of recognition of interrogational practice that fall short of outright physical torture but are known to be psychologically coercive and, as such, are in conflict with the Mendez Principles.

The Action Team have found during our earlier work that such a standpoint is often conceived through a misunderstanding as to the precise nature of effective interviewing. Our experiences in many countries have also demonstrated that law enforcement agencies are more likely to embrace an investigative interviewing approach when they are able to identify the negative effects of the established coercive interviewing techniques on their investigations and institutional goals. Indeed, this is the process by which the UK initially turned the tide from coercive and largely unskilled approaches to interviewing towards evidence-based and scientifically driven, systematic and, above all, *ethical* interviewing training and practices.

The Action Team's groundwork with certain countries (such as Cost.EU Member countries) has provided a proof of concept of how to inform key players (such as practitioners and policy makers), guide them through processes of policy, organisational and operational changes, and deliver a plan of implementation (and then help these countries undertake that plan). That experience of working with countries in the past has demonstrated that practices have evolved from generation to generation without the undertaking of any critical appraisal of these outdated techniques. However, at the same time as dispensing learning, the Action will remain open-minded as to whether there is also opportunity for the Action to learn from those countries (or at the very least) understand better the challenges involved in any country implementing the Mendez Principles. This will, in turn, help shape the training programme and further develop the scientific base.

The Action Team also recognises that managing expectations will be an important matter that will require attention. That is, the employment of investigative interviewing methods will, for some, necessitate the mastering of new skill sets and attitudes, in moving away from unethical methods that some may have employed for many years. Support measures need to be in place to discourage interviewers from returning to those coercive methods and ensuring that they do not turn back to problematic practices when experiencing resistance by difficult interviewees. Among these measures is the requirement to support supervisors so that they are given the skills and understanding of the Principles and, in turn, ensure they have the support and conviction of all senior ranks. Such learning will better reinforce lessons learned by front-line officers in the training room and ensure that they are embedded into common practices. As such, the first tier of training will be directed towards supervisor-ranked officers so that they can support their front-line counterparts.

The Action team will not be directly involved in changes to law. However, as part of the development towards any country's adoption of the Mendez Principles will be the need to advise if the frailties of current legal frameworks put at risk their adoption (e.g., advising in certain jurisdictions that confessions should only be admitted in any trial only when corroborated by other evidence).

The Action Team will adopt a 'train the trainer' methodology, provided through an incremental approach where we envisage and expect to gain optimum development of the Action through our engagement with countries who have either geographical proximity or existing close relationships. In such circumstances, while we continue to provide additional support to countries, they will be encouraged by the Action to seek leadership in those nearby countries (if the partner has advanced further towards implementing the Mendez Principles) or through providing each other with mutual support (if they are both similarly placed in their level of development), building in resilience.

In already working with those countries in implementing the Mendez principles, the Action Team have found that the challenges lie mainly in the practice of police and other law enforcement agencies. As such, the main area of influence of the networking in the Action will be focused in these areas. The Action Team who possess expertise in such matters, will convene networks with researchers, practitioners and policy makers around the world to facilitate meaningful partnerships to underpin and develop either initial frameworks, initiatives or action plans that directly enable the transition from unethical practices towards those interview techniques that have been established through research and practice as more ethical and more likely associated with just outcomes. The primary goal of the project is to effect a change to the state of the art: to facilitate the implementation of the Mendez Principles and transform the state of interviewing around the world. While ambitious, it is our considered and informed view that this goal is achievable.

The Action will be innovative by providing a platform for research teams around the world to identify those linguistic, cultural and legal factors relevant to the implementation of ethical

interviewing practices. The Action will also involve a strategic plan to deliver the importation of the Mendez Principles in diverse cultural contexts. The Action will innovate by involving practitioners, researchers and policymakers collaborating across diverse countries and regions internationally and will be novel by providing a forum for knowledge sharing and the development of specific strategies to facilitate consistency in the implementation of the ethical interviewing principles. The development of consistent strategies will be guided by the science that has emerged (and continues to emerge) from both field and experimental research conducted around the world (though not necessarily from every country). The Action will therefore be a significant step towards effective and wider application of the Mendez Principles. The Action will also address the critical need for a world-wide network of researchers, investigation practitioners and policy makers to ensure transition from coercive to ethical investigations world-wide.

The Action Team also have foreseen and taken measures to address the challenge of reaching out to countries who have yet to engage with the Mendez Principles. Here, among the experience of the Action Team's Management Committee (MC), are several members who have excellent international connections with researchers in around 100 countries across each part of the globe, reflecting the extent of credibility and reach of the Action Team (evidence available upon request). Such reach should also be viewed as strong indication of the Action Team's capacity to work with researchers from many countries as first steps to wider engagement that will also include practitioners and policy makers in these countries. From that experience, the Action Team know there are researchers in many countries quite isolated and who are unable alone to access the resources needed to play any role in the implementation of the Mendez Principles without involvement of this Action Team. The Action Team have also undertaken activity to build relationships with practitioners in many countries. An operational plan to incorporate more countries based on our regional networking Action is thought both feasible and likely.

Finally, countries (such as those Cost.EU member countries) that have adopted approaches to effective interviewing have each, with a few exceptions, in the main developed their own models, but are ones that have stayed largely faithful to the investigative interviewing (and rapport-based) approach. In turn, the Mendez Principles are highly consistent with that original model, and those subsequent adapted ones. In implementing the Mendez Principles, further regional or in-country adaptations of investigative interviewing models in line with the prevailing cultural and legal contexts etc. are then to be anticipated as likely. The commonality of all these existing models is that they encompass the Mendez Principles as set out in the 2021 formal documentation. (see <https://www.wcl.american.edu/impact/initiatives-programs/center/publications/documents/mendez-principles/>).

The Action Team will continue to be yet further innovative in adapting the Mendez Principles in order to be ensure their compatibility with particular countries' traditions and cultures (and indeed their existing practices, where these are broadly already in line with the Mendez Principles). Such approaches have already been found by the Action Team to enable countries to begin to embrace the Mendez principles and develop their own model of investigative interviewing.

Other innovations include the co-creation in countries or global regions, a network of Mendez Centres of Interviewing Excellence (hosted either by Government Departments or Universities). These Centres will be forums for ideas exchange within and between practitioner, academic researcher, and policy making communities and circles, and with other countries through the network, encouraging cross-border research, idea sharing and collaborations. These Centres will also be places of learning and skills enhancement supporting the Action Team training (and even, possibly, at advanced levels, formal education or accredited training). The Centres will also be those places where conditions are cultivated as part of the Action for further research, either conducted by the Action Team with in-country experts or by in-country stakeholders independently. Regardless, such Centres will provide opportunity where research can be either learned or undertaken and thus provide scope for scientific advancements. As such, the Centres will bolster a resilience model that will sustain scientific developments beyond the Action, undertaken locally to create evidence bases, allowing stakeholders hitherto inexperienced with the scientific research process to become familiar and more expert. Taking a leadership stance, the Action will (upon its commencement) create the initial Centre of Interviewing Excellence from which the subsequent ones will then duly emerge.

1.2.2. OBJECTIVES

1.2.2.1. *Research Coordination Objectives (see also 4.1.4)*

- Developed with stakeholders in countries a strategic Framework for Investigation Transformation (FIT – see 3.2.1 for details), underpinning the Mendez Principles that is

agreed through collaboration with networks of researchers, practitioners and policy makers in countries that are yet to fully adopt those principles.

- Have jointly developed with stakeholders adapted models of investigative interviewing that accommodate local contexts/cultures but do not distort the Mendez Principles, and continue to observe law, ethics and science (including accommodating any advances in science).
- Ensured the consistency of the application of the Mendez Principles when they are implemented in diverse linguistic, cultural and legal contexts and how it will function in local languages and traditions.
- Understood the language, cultural and legal contexts etc that may affect the effective implementation of ethical interviewing practices and apply the findings to the strategic plan within six months and develop innovative adaptations to the model within a further six months
- Designed and developed a range of training materials consistent with the Mendez Principles
- Formulated innovative models of investigative interviewing through adaptations of the Mendez Principles and begun delivery of training with countries
- Developed Centres of Mendez Interviewing Excellence.
- Developed national and regional networks of stakeholders (such as academics, practitioners, policy makers, NGOs etc.) to sustain implementation of the Mendez principles through and beyond the life-cycle of the Action
- Supported (through guidance, training, and counsel) all countries that have agreed FIT plans and the formulation of agreed legacy materials and structures for those countries

1.2.2.2. *Capacity-building Objectives*

Following the above timelines and country numbers, the Action first aims to build a networking structure that creates 'an ecosystem for learning' to implement the Mendez Principles. This ecosystem of learning would possess these elements:

- Legal frameworks and bases (such as the right to legal representation in interviews with suspects and adequate anti-torture regulation)
- Policies that support ethical interviewing, ensuring standards are transparent and accountable (such as audio/video recording of such interviews and those policies which incorporate measures to assist those viewed as vulnerable interviewees. Also, that senior management in policing adopt institutional policies that support the implementation of the Mendez Principles, and foster condition that prevent coercive practices)
- Understanding by police and law enforcement institutions (that adopt/adapt the methods of effective investigative interviewing)
- Training materials and educational support (including those in native languages) to help practitioners (with officers learning the methods of effective investigative interviewing through appropriate training materials, curriculum, supervision policies and instruments of assessment and evaluation, alongside the implementation of performance indicators that denote progress)
- Professional support and coaching (that relates to sufficient numbers of suitably qualified trainers in addition to a meaningful training regime that allows resources to learn and apply the learning)
- Research (undertaken to find what methods functioning effectively given local contexts, as well as police organisations providing sufficient access to police interview research data and research facilities to undertake such research). The data sets will arise from scientific missions, meetings, training events and other interfaces with researchers, policy makers, practitioners and other professionals, all subject to strict ethical clearances, conditions of participation, and data protection.

From these elements the Action Team will create a matrix of implementation plans, based on the countries' extent of existing exposure to the Mendez Principles. The Action aims to facilitate and support regional networks and in country networks (of researchers, practitioners and policy makers) can offer fresh insights to strengthen the pillars of the ecosystem while recognising and taking into account previous relevant implementation efforts by any country or region (or indeed, by any NGO such as APT, CTI, UNODCs). Further, amongst the Action Team are those who have experience of training lawyers and judges who represent those suspects interviewed by the police. Such experience will be vital in providing them with the tools and skills they need to undertake their roles professionally, while increasing their awareness and understanding of the Mendez Principles.

Such an ecosystem will be supported by the creation of various networked Mendez Centres of Interviewing Excellence (sponsored by Government/Universities) as the hubs for stakeholders to advance science, policy and practice during and beyond the Action. These will help sustain the Action during and beyond its lifecycle, but will also be a repository resource for professionals, researchers

and policy makers in order to help develop scientific enhancements and resilience during and beyond the Action.

The initial Action team will be expected by year 3 to increase from its current number of 36 proposers to over 60 with the additional proposers co-opted from both the existing practitioner, policy making and research communities, and also those countries with whom the Action Team engage during the Action's Phases, as the Action Team increasingly involved in both assisting countries in their formulation of models, development of the science, as well as delivering training. Several of these will also be asked to also become MC members of the Action. An alternate (probable additional) model will be for the Action to encourage new members to develop their own Cost Actions to support the overall aims of the initial Action. Of those co-opted at least 50% will be from either Cost.EU Member countries, ITCs, and NNCs or those countries in the Global South to increase their capacity to undertake research alongside more established scholars. Moreover, the Action Team has presently 25% of its membership as Cost.EU defined 'Young Researcher and Innovators (YRIs)', and during the course of the Action will maintain this figure at no less than 20%, developing the next generation of global researchers, again formally mentored by senior members of the Action Team. However, while The Action Team has a healthy cohort of YRIs, the Action Team overall is vastly experienced, with half of the Team number of 36 regarded as world-leading researchers in their academic fields (and 14 of whom have more than 25 years' experience as academics). These levels of experience and expertise will ensure that both these YRIs and their mid-career Action colleagues will be ably mentored and led during the Action where again, in due course, it is anticipated that additional experienced, world class researchers, practitioners and policy makers will be further co-opted, alongside the increased number of YRIs.

Finally, by the end of the Action, the Action Team will have developed a sustainable model, as detailed elsewhere in this Annex (e.g., the Mendez Centres of Interviewing Excellence) to proceed with continuing activities and expansion of the Action to reach at least 100 countries, ten years after the Action's commencement, with an Action Team of 80, including around 15 YRIs.

2. NETWORKING EXCELLENCE

2.1. ADDED VALUE OF NETWORKING IN S&T EXCELLENCE

2.1.1. ADDED VALUE IN RELATION TO EXISTING EFFORTS AT EUROPEAN AND/OR INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

This innovative, pioneering and important global convening Action builds on the Mendez Principles that are firmly based on science, law and ethics. These Principles clearly require avoidance of coercive/inhumane interrogation tactics wherever they occur while strongly advocating ethical and effective techniques/skills. However, enabling successful and wider implementation of the 'Principles' requires much awareness and deep understanding of the rich diversity of within-country cultural, historical, social, political and economic contexts that have contributed to the formulation of their legal traditions, criminal justice systems and policing practices. Moreover, the Action moves the Principles forward from its formal declaration in 2021 through a strategy of implementation to better ensure their integration, and thus adding value to the Principles.

The Action Team fully recognise that our introduction and implementation strategies may well be more problematic and challenging in some parts of the world. Though limited only by currently available resources, Action Team members already have direct experience of working with partners in 10- 15 countries, assisting in the introduction and implementation of ethical interview techniques. These experiences have provided insight – and proof of concept - as to how these challenges may be overcome, through working collaboratively with in-country professionals.

The 2021 Mendez Principles declaration, emergent from three years' work by the scientific and legal communities, represents a golden opportunity to introduce widescale policy, procedural and cultural change, but this can only be achieved with the momentum of a global network providing expertise and support in-country. These Principles, when read in light of UN instruments and emergent Strasbourg jurisprudence, are a game-changer. Globally, civil society will have increased intolerance with the use of torture, errors of justice and failed trials/investigations. However, even if a few countries individually commence considering developments that may eventually lead to acceptance of the 'Principles', no global strategy exists to assist such transition. The Action Team's MC have already begun developing a strategic plan of international engagement. The Action will thus step into the lacuna to provide facilitation for the necessary change. While some countries will inevitably be more eager or able than others to embrace these changes, without such leadership directly assisting those

based in countries and regions of the world where practices remain unethical/inhumane, any progress towards change will be very slow or absent.

The effects of such inertia include continued miscarriages of justice, alongside imbuing little public confidence in the police (and other investigative organisations) whose low ethical and professional standards would continue to be questioned and compromised by the undertaking of unethical and ineffective practices. The criminal justice system's entire legitimacy is thereby called into question. A more strategic and encompassing approach is required that convenes networks of researchers from a range of academic disciplines, policy makers, and practitioners to collaborate with each other to prompt changes (possibly for the first time in some countries) and/or with policy makers, practitioners and researchers elsewhere in the world to assist them.

As such, the Action will act as a basis for joint learning and co-produced transitional strategies over the Action's life-cycle, that first provide a framework to support collaborations, including cross-border ones, understanding of any barriers opportunities to introducing the Mendez Principles, as well as the wider benefits of their integration to professional practice, criminal justice policies and outcomes, assisting those key players (to begin to) implement the Principles. The Action Team recognise that in many countries this four-year Action would be insufficient to ensure a permanent transition to effective interviewing, but it will lay a strong foundation on which further future ones are built, to progress our mission on a more long-term, sustainable basis. This is not a weakness in the Action, but rather a strength as the Action Team seek to break new ground and effect genuine change.

2.2. ADDED VALUE OF NETWORKING IN IMPACT

2.2.1. SECURING THE CRITICAL MASS, EXPERTISE AND GEOGRAPHICAL BALANCE WITHIN THE COST MEMBERS AND BEYOND

As noted, several members of the Action Team have already commenced partnership working with the police in certain parts of the world to deliver training in effective interviewing. Many of the Action Team have substantial expertise and extensive experience in leading multi-national and international projects. As such, the Action Team have already established expertise, demonstrating that impact can be achieved by (i) supporting otherwise under-resourced and isolated researchers in these countries; (ii) mentoring and engaging with practitioners and police leaders; and (iii) mutual engagement and co-production with policy and law makers. Moreover, the Action Team has extensive experience and global credibility in the undertaking of funded projects that have involved multiple countries involving various aspects of investigative interviewing from various academic disciplinary standpoints. These various endeavours reflect our established networks with stakeholders, alongside our experience and substantive understanding of other societies and cultures, which will serve as the basis for a successful template for the Action.

The Action Team represents a very timely opportunity to significantly develop existing work, evolving from the baseline of learning what practices are being undertaken, towards providing assistance and guidance to researchers in countries with fewer resources, and designing and delivering training programmes that enable practitioners to conduct ethical and effective interviewing. The Action Team will convene viable and sustainable networks of researchers within countries and regions with a view to them transitioning to ethical interviewing practices.

2.2.2. INVOLVEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS

The involvement of stakeholders (practitioners, and policy makers) will be at the heart of the Action. The Action Team already know from our existing activity that these key stakeholders will be investigation practitioners (largely, the police), lawyers and judges alongside key policy makers and researchers/scholars in that country. In order to help substantiate the scientific developments that the Action Team will undertake as adaptations of the Principles, the Action will bring together these stakeholders to develop their own in-country/regional networks to create inter-disciplinary networks but also intra-disciplinary ones too. We will also encourage and support these stakeholders to engage with other key stakeholders too (that is, suspects, victims and witnesses) in undertaking research to further build the scientific base in that country.

It is the Action Team's role to facilitate the conditions whereby a successful implementation of the Mendez Principles can be achieved. However, the major role in the implementation, as it should be, will be that of the stakeholders themselves. After their identification, the Action Team will formulate an agreed plan with them to involve them in the Action. The Action Team's role will be to support, advise, and counsel, and in so doing build in resilience. The Action team will also deliver training, but even then, the 'train the trainer' model will be adopted. Aside from building resilience through, supporting, advising and counselling the stakeholders, the Action team will also instigate and develop

the essential networking, both regionally and in-country, that will be required for regions and countries to be self-supporting and sustainable.

These stakeholders are best placed to understand the adaptations required for the implementation of the Mendez Principles that reflect particular cultural and legal contexts. For this reason, The Action's initial networking with these stakeholders will be to address these challenges and help develop with them particular strategies that accommodate such contexts to enable successful adaptation (without distorting the Mendez Principles). Here, our existing work, only constrained by resources, has already led to several countries that once largely favoured coercive and accusatorial tactics to accommodate the steps towards transformation to investigative interviewing methods. The Action Team have developed a template of effective collaboration with these key stakeholders. Our partnership with them will reflect the translation of the Principles into national contexts, practice and training curricula, which is fundamental to the Action.

3. IMPACT

3.1. IMPACT TO SCIENCE, SOCIETY AND COMPETITIVENESS, AND POTENTIAL FOR INNOVATION/BREAK-THROUGHS

3.1.1. SCIENTIFIC, TECHNOLOGICAL, AND/OR SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS (INCLUDING POTENTIAL INNOVATIONS AND/OR BREAKTHROUGHS)

The Action will be supported by a highly interdisciplinary team of international researchers (many of whom are highly experienced and regarded as leading experts in their field), drawing from theory and methodologies from social and behavioural sciences (see 4.1.1 below). This interdisciplinarity will stimulate innovation and the development of new approaches to studying the questioning of suspects, victims and witnesses through the prism of differing national and international contexts, enriching our understanding as to how to apply the most effective interviewing principles in different policing, legal, criminal justice, cultural, social and economic traditions.

The Action Team would foresee that the scientific impacts include the creation of a corpus data bank on police and law enforcement interviewing from training delivered by members of the network. Furthermore, our endeavours would be expected to promote more research with a clear map and multidisciplinary perspectives on effective interviewing principles in different policing, legal, criminal justice, culture, and socio-economic conditions. The Action Team would also expect technological developments pertinent to the adaption of the Mendez Principles of effective interviewing in those various contexts and cultures that would allow for the growth and spread in knowledge of the principles to a wider audience.

In terms of societal impacts, the Action will also serve civil society through increasing its intolerance with the use of torture, errors of justice and failed trials/investigations, while making them aware of the components of just outcomes.

The Action Team will ensure that the potential academic impact of our work is realised by publishing our results promptly in high-impact scientific journals and presenting regularly at scientific meetings and conferences. Building on the Action team's strong track record of research outputs (numbered collectively in excess of 2,000 publications, including very many in top-ranking academic journals), the Action Team will also place details of the research online (for example, on open-access institutional repositories), to make it accessible to the wider academic community. Further academic impact will result from the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge/skills within and between the collaborating institutions involved in this Action from across the globe.

3.2. MEASURES TO MAXIMISE IMPACT

3.2.1. KNOWLEDGE CREATION, TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT

An important pillar of the project's strategy is the formulation of an ecosystem for learning for countries that still practice coercive tactics to support the adoption of the Mendez principles and the transfer of knowledge. Among the activities that we will undertake are conducting train-the-trainer sessions and workshops, the implementation of reform working groups and/or the development of coaching and supervision roles within police, prosecution, judges, and legal practice. For each country, a customized Framework for Investigative Transformation that will cover areas such as

- Mandatory audio/video recording of interviews
- Development of training models that enable both the introduction of effective investigative

interviewing, alongside that which supports continuing professional development

- Training of Police (both supervisors and frontline staff), lawyers and Judiciary (including the awareness and understanding of contributory factors into false confessions/testimony)
- The development of a national curriculum that supports a national roll-out of a training curriculum, that enables effective and wide dissemination of knowledge and skills in a systematic manner
- Developing an organisational culture that reinforces the importance of following the Mendez Principles, and resists (even is intolerant) of any return to coercive interviewing techniques
- Development of a rapport-based model that respects human rights and international law (with any necessary adaptation for it to be concomitant with particular cultural and legal contexts)
- The development of an evidence base that is continually developing and recognizes the ongoing advances in scientific growth concerning investigative interviewing.

3.2.2. PLAN FOR DISSEMINATION AND/OR EXPLOITATION AND DIALOGUE WITH THE GENERAL PUBLIC OR POLICY

Aside from disseminating papers and reports to academic, and professional communities, dissemination to the public will include the following (as agreed with stakeholders)

- Use of social media
- Undertaking regular policy briefings with agreement with host country
- Creation of a website that is regularly updated (and websites constructed in host countries)
- Interaction and regular engagement with print and broadcasting media

A plan (such as Figure 1 below) will be constructed and agreed with each partner country.

Figure 1: Specimen communications map

Products	Target Date	Materials	Audience	Lead contributors	Partners	Comm strategy
Website updates including a repository of materials						
Social media: Twitter/Facebook/Instagram/LinkedIn						
Media interface						
Publications (Professional & Academic)						
Policy Bulletins etc.						

4. IMPLEMENTATION

4.1. COHERENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WORK PLAN

4.1.1. DESCRIPTION OF WORKING GROUPS, TASKS AND ACTIVITIES

The interdisciplinary international team have expertise in areas of investigative interviewing/interrogation of suspects, victims and witnesses *and* engaging with different cultural challenges when engaging in international networks. The team includes expertise in investigative interviewing from the perspective of the following disciplines:

Anthropology;
Applied criminology/criminology;
Criminal law;
Criminal investigation;
Criminal justice;
Forensic linguistics;
Forensic psychiatry;
Forensic psychology;
Human Rights;

Interpreting studies;
Interrogational Torture;
Legal Psychology;
Neuroscience;
Policing science;
Political science;
Sociology;
Victimology/Victim studies; and
Zemiology.

The team represent a breadth of multi-disciplinary researchers. The complexity of introducing and implementing the Mendez Principles necessitates such a composite of these key academic disciplines, in addition to practitioners and policy makers. Such a fusion of interdisciplinarity and expertise provides multi-faceted recognition and understanding of contemporary practices particular to each country formed through their procedures, policies and laws, established over many decades. As such, the co-production of strategy and delivery of the Action requires multi-disciplinary insights to support such transitions to effective interviewing. This multi-disciplinary expertise also allows for engagement with practitioners and policy makers, recognising that the core team has substantial expertise and experience in collaborating with these two groups of stakeholders.

The Action will also have an independent Action Progress Board (APB) monitoring the Action's developments, and with whom the Action Team's MC will regularly report throughout the Action (in addition to reporting to Cost.EU). The independent Action Progress Board members (two males, two females), who have agreed to undertake this critical scrutinising role, all have the most senior of profiles and relevant expertise with internationally respected reputations, situating them well to ensure the Action meets its stated milestones.

The Action builds on foundation work variously undertaken by Action Team members that has examined and developed practice in certain countries. For example, Action Team members have led researchers and worked extensively with practitioners throughout the world, where their various endeavours have identified interview/interrogation practices in over 80 countries, with implementation plans well developed in some of these. Action Team members have also formed research groups in the Global South. We have already undertaken collaborations with almost all Cost.EU Member countries and some NNCs, though many of these have yet to transform their practices. Yet others in the Action Team have undertaken, as leading members of various international projects (mostly the EU) in the last decade, projects that have established policies to help develop lawyers' skills and also safeguard criminal suspects' rights during interviews/interrogations.

Action Team members have also engaged with senior personnel from key NGOs, UN and EU agencies and most senior practitioners from various countries, undertaking training in techniques that follow the Mendez Principles. Finally, some of the Action Team have been funded by influential high-profile projects, and thus have been at the forefront of developing scientific evidence to underpin interviewing/interrogation (evidence of all these endeavours can be provided upon request).

Action Team members have a wealth of experience in working with policy makers by contributing ideas and helping support introduction and implementation of policies and practice. For example, team members have undertaken the training of lawyers and legal representatives. A few of our Action Team members were amongst those on the UN steering committee that formulated the 'Mendez Principles'. Collectively, this team has huge experience and expertise (as evidenced in the submitted CVs of the Action Team), in working with researchers, practitioners and policy makers around the world that enables us to be very well placed to have real credibility with each and all of these three groups, as well as providing confidence that the Action Team can achieve the set goals. Further, the team is highly experienced in project planning and management, as well as in understanding the importance of evidence-based practice, and developing yet further the science behind such techniques.

The breadth of international expertise of the Action team also ensures a depth of awareness and familiarity exist as to the importance of considering cultural and ethnic diversity. These endeavours reflect the international reach and expertise of the Action team, that can credibly engage with key players in countries around the world to formulate viable research, policy and practice networks that will support the wider introduction *and implementation* of the Mendez Principles. The team will act as guides to support in-country practitioners, policy makers and researchers to develop their own timescales, sustainable networks frameworks, structures, and strategies, tailored to that country's particular ability to transition effectively.

The Action will consist of four phases conducted incrementally over four years (see Gantt Chart at 4.1.4 of this Memorandum of Understanding). In each of these four phases, the Action Team will be divided into smaller active Working Groups (WGs), each of around nine Action Team members. Each of these WGs will possess at least 50% MC membership (and thus at least 50% Cost.EU full members), a minimum of the four vastly experienced (and world-leading) Action Team members, at least 2 YRIs, a suitable gender balance and geographical coverage, and a representation of various academic disciplines.

Each of the WGs will operate in separate global regions in each of the four phases. In Phase 1, for example, the first four WGs will be anticipated to conduct activities where the Action Team has the strongest foothold currently and where those countries are known to be showing most promise as early adopters. Thus, the Action will be conducted in Europe, Asia and Africa, as well as with Cost.EU NNCs. Over the lifespan of the Action, more proposers will be increasingly co-opted to the Action Team, leading to a commensurate increase in the number of WGs, incrementally leading to increased collaborations with other countries from those Phase 1 regions (during Phase 2). Such Action team/WG augmentation will also allow further collaborations with countries in Africa and Asia, as well as the Americas in Phases 3 and 4 of the Action (to ensure anonymity of the Action Team, as per strict Cost.EU guidance, details of countries have been kept concealed throughout the Memorandum of Understanding).

4.1.2. DESCRIPTION OF DELIVERABLES AND TIMEFRAME

By the end of Year 4 of the Action:

The Action Team will have

- Constructed a website to record and promote Action activities, progress and publish all calls for participation in networking activities and grants.
- Authored policy reports and briefings to national, regional and international bodies to advise of progress, pitfalls and opportunities of the implementation of the Mendez Principles
- Authored Scientific papers in peer reviewed journals etc that relate to the implementation of the Mendez Principles
- Published an edited textbook of the challenges and benefits of the implementation of the Mendez Principles
- Designed training materials including podcasts and seminars that are consistent with the Mendez Principles
- Co-designed with key stakeholders in various countries a FIT to include strategy and roadmaps towards their implementation of the Mendez Principles
- Created Mendez Centres of Interviewing Excellence, hosted, for example, by a Government Department and/or a university where the co-ordination of all the agencies and stakeholders will be undertaken, and where implementation will be co-managed.

4.1.3. RISK ANALYSIS AND CONTINGENCY PLANS

There may be countries uninterested or unwelcoming to the overtures of the Action. For example, they may insist on developing their own responses or none at all to the Mendez Principles. Similar issues have been confronted at times during our current small-scale activities that have been overcome by negotiation and by role modelling.

As the Action develops over time, the Action Team will also use those successful case studies and indeed representatives from the countries/regions themselves, added as further Action team members, being ambassadors, trailblazers and pathway guides (as appropriate) who can use their own recent experiences to help overcome reluctance and help build resilience elsewhere.

There may be likely challenges in having a large, multi-disciplinary team of international researchers, practitioners and policy makers. There may be staffing changes. Nevertheless, it is expected that the Action team (and its MC) will grow in number as well as expertise, being organic, as new Action Team members are co-opted, particularly from those countries with whom the Action has already started to implementation activities (while maintaining a suitable gender balance, and at least 20% of the Action Team as YRIs). We are confident that the expected increase in the Action Team will occur since the numbers wishing to join the Action were above and beyond that actual number of proposers. As such, we will incrementally co-opt other proposers in a managed manner, in line with the phased development of the Action.

It is possible that for some countries/regions there will neither be hosts nor resources for the establishment of our preferred model of physical Mendez Centres of Interviewing Excellence situated within countries or regions. Should this occur, the Action Team will develop virtual Centres, hosted by

the Action's initial Centre and administrated by the Action Team, as part of its legacy support. However, opportunities will continue to be sought so as to eventually establish in-country/regional networks of Centres, even if such arrangements cannot be made in the short-term.

Ultimately, the Action Team expect the Mendez Principles to impact the future development of law, practice and policy in those countries where implementation continues to be challenging. In October 2022, the current UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, Alice

Edwards, spoke to the UN General Assembly, and received universal support for her message that it is time for renewed action, calling on leaders at all levels "to take action" (i.e., to prevent cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment). However, such a call was made knowing that such practices are still occurring in many countries. The Action Team, like her, firmly believe that the time has come for these unethical practices to cease, to help prevent more ruined lives and miscarriages of justice. This Cost Action will thus make an irreversible and global difference.

4.1.4. GANTT DIAGRAM

